



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,083	09/30/2004	Hugh Alexander Spikes	550-594	9948

23117 7590 08/28/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
----------

FOOTLAND, LENARD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3682

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Applicant's election with traverse of the species of Fig('s). 3a-b is acknowledged. Contrary to applicant's listing, claim(s) 7-22 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected species, not all claims depending upon or otherwise including the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Because of required separate searches, the restriction is made final.

APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO ILLUSTRATE ALL CLAIMED FEATURES, PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO THE ELECTED SPECIES, WITH HIS RESPONSE, OR BE HELD NONCOMPLIANT.

*Applicant is reminded that if the amendment of any claims results in a change of the species they read upon, that is required to be indicated. Failure to do so will be construed as an indication that the readability has not changed. In addition, if any new claims are added, it is required that the applicant indicate which of them read on the elected species. Failure to do so will result in a holding of nonresponsiveness.*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

Art Unit: 3682

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. ("Tanaka").

Tanaka discloses all of the claimed elements including, for example, in Tanaka's 6<sup>th</sup> embodiment, Fig's. 12a-b at col. 17, line 55 to col. 18, line 58. Note converging surfaces near 19b and col. 18, line 40 repellent coating, for half-wetting.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-5 (and claims 7-22 in the alternative to being withdrawn) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tanaka as set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 23-26 above, and further in view of official notice of common knowledge in the art, and/or, in the alternative, engineering design choice.

The examiner finds that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 3682

to provide the additional or alternative features oil and oilophilic and -phobic surfaces and the particular environments in question, since it was known in the art to do so to provide the function(s) disclosed.

Alternatively or additionally, the examiner finds that the broad provision of these features *vis-à-vis* those disclosed by the reference solves no stated problem insofar as the record is concerned and, accordingly, would have been an obvious matter of design choice. See *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975).

Also, the selection of a known material based on its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill in the art. *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 199, 125 USPQ 416, 418 (CCPA 1960).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenard A. Footland, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7103.

**Fax: 703-872-9326**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lenard A. Footland".

Lenard A. Footland

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 3600

Art Unit 3682

Application/Control Number: 10/509,083

Page 5

Art Unit: 3682

laf

August 24, 2006